

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

6
7 TOMAHAWK MANUFACTURING, INC.,
et al.,

Case No. 2:23-cv-01007-APG-NJK

8 Plaintiff(s),

Order

9 v.
10 SPHERICAL INDUSTRIES, INC., et al.,
11 Defendant(s).

[Docket No. 86]

12 Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' renewed emergency motion for a protective order
13 concerning the restriction on sensitive materials for experts who are themselves competitors.
14 Docket No. 86.

15 Plaintiffs' motion is supported by a single legal citation articulating the uncontroversial
16 position that the Court has broad discretion to fashion a protective order. *Id.* at 3. The motion
17 contains no legal authority whatsoever regarding the actual issue in dispute, however, despite the
18 fact that cursory legal research reveals a number of decisions on this issue from courts within the
19 Ninth Circuit.¹ The parties were required to conduct this legal research themselves and to discuss
20 it during the meet-and-confer. *See, e.g., Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, 151 F.R.D. 118, 120
21 (D. Nev. 1993). Whether they did so is unclear from the papers. Such legal research also should
22 have been discussed in the motion practice itself. *See, e.g., On Demand Direct Response, LLC v.*
23 *McCart-Pollak*, 2018 WL 2014067, at *1 n.2 (D. Nev. Apr. 30, 2018) (explaining that discovery
24 motions are not exempt from the requirement to present well-developed legal argument).
25 Accordingly, the renewed emergency motion for protective order is **DENIED** without prejudice.

26
27

¹ As explained by former United States Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen, a magistrate judge
28 is not "the Maytag repairman of federal judges desperately hoping for something to do." *Mazzeo
v. Gibbons*, 2010 WL 3020021, at *1 (D. Nev. July 27, 2010). The Court declines to provide its
own legal research to the parties herein because that is the job of counsel in the first instance.

1 If the parties have not discussed the case law on the specific issue in dispute, then they
2 must engage in further conferral efforts by 5:00 p.m. on September 8, 2023. Any renewed motion
3 must address such legal authority and must be filed by September 11, 2023. The response thereto
4 must be filed by September 13, 2023, and any reply must be filed by September 14, 2023.²

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: September 6, 2023

7 
8 Nancy J. Koppe
9 United States Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ² Counsel should note that any briefing deadlines automatically generated by CMECF do
not apply and, instead, the deadlines set herein govern. Local Rule IC 3-1(d).